

## REMARKS

Claims 17-26, 28-41, and 43-52 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-16 were previously canceled, and claims 27 and 42 are canceled herein. Claims 17, 32, 47 and 50 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 17, 18, 20, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 41, 42, 46, 47 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407, hereinafter “Russell”) in view of Yamamoto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,355,338, hereinafter “Yamamoto”). Claims 19, 21-25, 28-31, 34, 36-40, 43-45, and 48-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell and Yamamoto, in view other prior art. Applicant respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 17, which has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 27 as previously presented, recites, “each information data block contains an information data block identifier and audio information data, and each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data.” The Final Office Action states that Russell discloses this feature in lines 1-27 of column 11. Russell, however, does not teach or suggest these limitations. Rather, Russell discloses “Tag Tables” 75A which 76B which are used to list the properties describing a certain interval of speech. (See Russell, column 11, lines 12-17.) Properties disclosed by Russell include beginning times, end times, lists of additional tables that categorize the speech, and who is speaking. (See Russell, column 11, lines 12-17.) Russell, however, does not disclose signal pause data block identifier. Yamamoto, which was used by the Examiner to address other limitations, does not disclose this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 18-26 and 28-31 depend from claim 17 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 32, which has been amended to include the limitations of claim 42 as previously presented, has been amended to recite, “each information data block contains an information data block identifier and audio information data, and each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data.” As discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 32 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 33-41 and 43-46 depend from claim 32 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 47 has been amended to recite, “wherein each information data block contains an information data block identifier and audio information data [and]each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data.” As discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 47 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 48 and 49 depend from claim 47 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 50 has been amended to recite, "each information data block contains an information data block identifier and audio information data, and each signal pause data block contains a signal pause data block identifier and signal pause duration data." As discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 17, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this limitation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 50 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 51 and 52 depend from claim 50 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this response complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant further submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Benjamin E. Nise Applicant's Attorney at the number listed below. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,



Benjamin E. Nise  
Reg. No. 55,500  
Attorney for Applicant

2/2/2010  
Date  
SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, TX 75252  
Tel: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218